

In contradistinction, Tipirneni discloses a camera system 100, and uploading system 50 to transmit digital signals through internet 100 to host server 110. Physician computer 150 then accesses the images stored in server 110 through the internet 100.

BUT.. camera 100 and uploader 50 DOES NOT access the stored images in server 110 through the internet 100.

In other words, contrary to our "subscribers" which both cause the images to be stored in the server and accessing of the images, Tipirneni stores images through camera 100 and uploader 50 through the internet 100 to server 110 which stores same, but does not access same. The accessing is done by physician computer 150, but, which does not cause storage of the image in server 110.

Thus, our invention comprises a plurality of subscribers which can both register or store medical images in server through the network and also access the registered or stored images, through the internet.

Clearly, Tirpirneni is not the same as nor even if extended would not make obvious our recited invention, wherein the plurality of subscribers, through contract with the single server, can have medical images both registered in the single server and also access same. Pirpenini has a camera uploader system which register images through the internet in a server, and then for access uses a separate computer, such as at a physicians office. Also, in the accessing, the doctor must first call up the server web site and log unto the desired medical facility web page, then select a desired patient's name, then call up the images for that patient. But, the doctor

cannot then send images himself through the internet for register or storage in the server. A clear and important lack of flexibility and economy.

In contrast, our invention encompasses a plurality of subscribers connected to the internet, and having a contract with a single server, wherein the different subscribers can each register or store medical images in the server, and also, access the stored images. In this manner, we eliminate complexity of mutual contracts between different subscribers and requirement of different procedures for register and access of medical information. Tipirneni does not and cannot do this. Thus, any extension of Tipirneni would not make obvious our recited invention.

Barnes 6,912,317 was cited by the Examiner to show that compression/decompression of data was old. But, our compression/decompression step is not asserted by the applicant to be new per se. It is the combination of such step(s) together with the other steps and hardware which, as recited in main claim 93, et seq, which is novel and patentable. Clearly, adding compression/decompression of data is not per se asserted to be novel or patentable. But, the other steps in combination with compression/decompression of data is new and patentable as above discussed with reference to Tipirneni. Thus, clearly, combining Barnes with Tipirneni would still not make obvious our recited invention of claims 77-87, and 89-94.

In view of the foregoing, applicant respectfully solicits
reconsideration and allowance.

Respectfully

M. KOJIMA

MOONRAY KOJIMA

BOX 627

WILLIAMSTOWN, MA 01267

Tel (413)458-2880

8 Oct 05